

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached 17 sheets of drawings include Figures 1, 2, 3A-B, 4, 5A-F and 6A-F and replace the original sheets including Figures 1, 2, 3A-B, 4, 5A-F and 6A-F. No substantive changes have been made to the Figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-49 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 25, 34, 39 and 42 have been amended. Claims 19, 29, 37, 38, 45, 46 and 47 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Hence, claims 1-18, 20-28, 30-36, 39-44, 48 and 49 remain pending. Reconsideration of the subject application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0036922 to Fries et al. (hereinafter “Fries”).

Claim 1 now includes elements from claim 19, claim 25 now includes subject matter from claim 29, claim 34 now includes subject matter from claims 37 and 38, claim 39 has been amended to correct a reference to a canceled claim, and claim 42 now includes subject matter from claims 45, 46 and 47. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of all claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because the cited reference does not teach all of the claim limitations, either expressly or inherently, as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Specifically, for example, claim 30 recites “using the identifier to search the database and select from the property record documents a set of relevant documents relating to the parcel; . . . using the set of relevant documents to produce a data summary.” Fries does not teach this. While Fries does appear to teach a title examination system, Fries’ system does not identify relevant documents and use the set of relevant documents to produce a data summary. Moreover, Fries does not teach scoring relevant documents based on their degree of relevance as recited in claims 34 and 42. The paragraphs in Fries cited by the Office Action as teaching a document scoring system (¶¶ [0037]-[0038]) appear to relate to a parcel scoring system and have nothing to do with a system for scoring the relevance of documents. Hence, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 30, 34 and 42 are believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 1 and 25 have been amended to include references to an input system (claim 25) and associated method steps (claim 1). Fries does not teach an input system. The Office Action cites ¶¶[0043]-[0044] for these teachings, but the recited elements are clearly missing from these paragraphs, which appear to be a general system description. Hence, claims 1 and 25 are believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reasons.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above and are believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 5, 2007

/Irvin E. Branch/

Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
60895463 v1